

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL LITTLETON,  
Petitioner,  
v.  
JOE BIDEN,  
Respondent.

No. 2:24-cv-0449 AC P

ORDER AND FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS

By an order filed February 27, 2024, petitioner was ordered to file a completed in forma pauperis application or pay the filing fee and was cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. ECF No. 3. The thirty-day period has now expired, and petitioner has not filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis, paid the filing fee, or otherwise responded to the court's order.


Although it appears from the file that petitioner's copy of the order was returned, petitioner was properly served. It is the petitioner's responsibility to keep the court apprised of his current address at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective.

In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court is directed to assign a district judge to this case.

IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice.

1           These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge  
2 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days  
3 after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections  
4 with the court. Such a document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings  
5 and Recommendations.” Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified  
6 time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153  
7 (9th Cir. 1991).

8 DATED: April 15, 2024

9   
10 ALLISON CLAIRE  
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28